

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/645,180

Applicant(s)

CELI ET AL.

Examiner

TuyetLien (Lien) T. Tran

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 27 and 29-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 27, 29-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 2179

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communication: Amendment filed 8/22/07.

**This action is made non-final.**

2. Claims 1-13, 27, 29-40 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 27 are independent claims.

### Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/22/07 has been entered.

### Claim Objections

4. Claim 14 has been cancelled; therefore, the previous objection on claim is dropped.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. Applicant's amendment corrects the previous rejection; therefore, the previous rejection is withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

*(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.*

**7. Claims 1-13, 27, 29-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuli (Patent No US 6,941,382 B1; hereinafter Tuli) in view of Aoki et al. (Pub No US 2003/0016253 A1; hereinafter Aoki).**

**As to claim 1, Tuli teaches:**

A method for displaying a web page on a display screen (e.g., see Fig. 1 and col. 1 lines 29-40) comprising:

creating a web page bitmap image from a first web page displayed on a browser (e.g., translating html images into raster images or color images, see col. 2 lines 23-32; note that raster images are also referred to as bit map images, see col. 4 lines 55-56);

dividing the web page bitmap image into a plurality of fragments including a first web page bitmap image fragment and second web page bitmap image fragment (e.g., see Figs. 2, 3 and col. 2 lines 38-47);

wherein the step of dividing the web page bitmap image splits a hyperlink image on the web page bitmap image into a first hyperlink segment on the first web page bitmap image fragment and a second hyperlink segment on the second web page bitmap image fragment (e.g., note that the image is further divided into smaller sections that are equal in size as shown in Fig. 2; see col. 3 lines 3-10; those skilled in the art would have realized that when the web page image is divided into equal sections, the URL that lies between the sections would be divided into the web page fragments as well);

displaying the first web page bitmap image on the display screen (e.g., see Fig. 2);

Tuli does not expressly teach analyzing a HTML code for the first web page; however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the function of analyzing a HTML code for the first web page because Tuli suggests

Art Unit: 2179

to the skilled artisan that the translator program can translates the image such that words that represents links on the page 5 are translated to be slightly bolder (e.g., see col. 3 lines 3-10; of course, it is obvious that the HTML code is analyzing to identify hyperlink contained within the web page image). The motivation is to provide the ability to a user to interact with the web image on small display device just like the way that one can be able to interact with a normal web page.

Furthermore, Tuli does not expressly teach:

wherein when the user clicks on a pixel of the first web page bitmap image fragment, an image map instructs the browser to go to a second web page indicated by the web page hyperlink;

wherein the user is directed to the second web page even though the web page hyperlink had been fragmented and the pixel clicked on by the user is not on the first hyperlink segment.

Aoki, though, teaches that image maps are a widely used technique allowing users to perform graphical selections of active areas within a displayed image map (e.g., see [0004]).

Aoki suggests to a skilled artisan that:

when a user clicks on a pixel of a first web page bitmap image fragment/area, an image map instructs the browser to go to a second web page indicated by the web page hyperlink (e.g., image maps are formed by associating an image with hyperlink targets or active areas. When a user clicks on one of the hyperlink targets or active areas, the browser displays an additional hypertext document, see [0004]);

wherein the user is directed to the second web page even though the web page hyperlink had been fragmented and the pixel clicked on by the user is not on the first hyperlink

Art Unit: 2179

segment (e.g., note that image map technology allows any image area to be associated with a hyperlink and that clicking on any pixel or part of the image area can activate the hyperlink).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the image map technology as taught by Aoki to the method of displaying a webpage on a handheld device as taught by Tuli to achieve the claimed invention. The motivation for the combination is provide fast access to the Internet such that refreshing pages is quick and efficient (e.g., see Tuli col. 1 lines 24-28)..

**As to claim 27**, claim 27 reflects a computer program product encoded and stored on a computer readable medium (e.g., see Fig. 1, col. 1 lines 29-40 and col. 2 lines 56-62) for performing the steps as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

**As to claims 2 and 29**, Tuli further teaches determining if the size of a web page is larger than a display screen (e.g., see col. 2 lines 34-38); and responsive to a determination that the web page is larger than the display screen, performing the creating step (e.g., see col. 2 lines 38-47).

**As to claims 3 and 30**, Tuli further teaches wherein the fragment is displayed at the web page's intended resolution (e.g., see Fig. 2).

**As to claims 4 and 31**, Tuli teaches the limitations of claims 1, 14, and 28 for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 1, 14, and 28 above. Tuli does not expressly disclose that responsive to a determination that the web page is not larger than the display screen, displaying the unmodified web page. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a function or step of responsive to a determination that the web page is not larger than the display screen, displaying

Art Unit: 2179

the unmodified web page, in view of Tuli, because Tuli suggests to the skilled artisan that since web page images to be displayed in a browser window 6 are usually larger than the displayable area of the browser window 6, images are divided into smaller section (e.g., see col. 2 lines 34-47) to enhance the server's processing speed, data transfer and retrieval to and from the portable devices (see col. 1 lines 15-19); in other word, if a web page is not larger than the display screen, displaying the unmodified web page in order to avoid the process of translation, division, compression, and decompression; thus, to increase the speed of processing since the web page is small enough for quick data transfer, retrieval to and from the portable devices (e.g., see col. 1 lines 15-19 and col. 2 lines 18-47).

***As to claims 5 and 32***, Tuli teaches further comprising:

recording a location of at least one hyperlink (e.g., col. 3 lines 3-10);

creating an image segment on an image map in the same location of the hyperlink (e.g., image words that represent links on the page 5 in Fig. 2 are translated to be slightly bolder, see col. 3 lines 3-10); and

wherein the image segment directs the user to another web page or location (e.g., see col. 3 lines 24-33).

***As to claims 6 and 33***, Tuli teaches further comprising calculating the number of x-axis divisions (e.g., see Fig. 2; note that image 5 is divided into 2 x-axis divisions).

***As to claims 7 and 34***, Tuli teaches further comprising calculating the number of x-axis divisions (e.g., see Fig. 2; note that image 5 is divided into 2 y-axis divisions).

***As to claims 8 and 35***, Tuli teaches further comprising:

Art Unit: 2179

determining if a user wants to navigate the web page image (e.g., see col. 2 lines 56-63); and

responsive to a determination that a user wants to navigate the web page image, running a navigation program (e.g., programs that causes other portions of the images to be displayed when the user scrolls up, down, or sideways to these parts of the image, see col. 2 lines 54-67).

**As to claims 9 and 36**, Tuli further teaches wherein the displaying step occurs on a hand held display device (e.g., the information is received by a palm top device 12 in Fig. 1 is then decompressed and displayed in its display window 13, see col. 2 lines 54-57).

**As to claims 10 and 37**, Tuli teaches the limitation of claims 1, 14, and 28 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claims 1, 14, and 28 above. Tuli further teaches accessing the web page through a proxy (e.g., host computer 1 as shown in Fig. 1). Tuli fails to expressly teach that the proxy sends only one fragment to a hand held display device. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the function of sending only one fragment to a hand held display device, in view of Tuli, because Tuli suggests to the skilled artisan that sections of a web page image are decompressed and displayed in the order of priority such that the priority section is decompressed and displayed first (e.g., see col. 2 lines 56-60) to enhance the server's processing speed, data transfer and retrieval to and from the portable devices (see col. 1 lines 15-19).

**As to claims 11 and 38**, Tuli teaches the limitation of claims 10, 23, and 37 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claims 10, 23, and 37 above. Tuli further teaches requesting another fragment (e.g., see col. 2 lines 59-63). Tuli fails to expressly teach that the

Art Unit: 2179

proxy sends another fragment to a hand held display device. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the function of sending another fragment to a hand held display device, in view of Tuli, because Tuli suggests to the skilled artisan that other portions are sequentially decompressed and stored to be displayed later when the user scrolls up, down, or sideways to these parts of the image (e.g., see col. 2 lines 59-63) to enhance the server's processing speed, data transfer and retrieval to and from the portable devices (see col. 1 lines 15-19).

***As to claims 12 and 39***, Tuli teaches the limitation of claims 10, 23, and 37 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claims 10, 23, and 37 above. Tuli further teaches wherein the web page image is identified by a unique identifier (e.g., a uniform resource identifier – URL - of a web page; as well-known in the art at the time the invention was made, URL is used to identified a web page from the internet or WWW, see col. 3 lines 24-35).

***As to claims 13 and 40***, Tuli further teaches wherein the web page image is stored in an image file ending in .gif, .jpg, or .bmp (e.g., see col. 4 lines 30-35).

### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13, 27, 29-40 have been considered but are moot in new ground of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action.



Art Unit: 2179

It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TuyetLien (Lien) T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-270-1033. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday: 7:30 - 5:00, off on alternating Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

T.T  
10/23/2007

Lien Tran  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2179

  
WEILUN LO  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINEE